

of India on 1st November 1956 and are continued by the State Government.

Fresh Second Five-Year Plan in respect of the New State of Mysore.

Q.—286. Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL (Brahmavar).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether they have prepared a fresh Second Five-Year Plan and submitted it to the Central Government ;

(b) if not, whether they propose to take steps to prepare a fresh Plan in respect of the New Mysore State ?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(a) No. The Second Five-Year Plans of the different States, of which certain areas have been ceded to form part of the New Mysore State, had already been approved by the respective Governments and the Planning Commission. Those Plans have now been integrated into the Second Five-Year Plan of the New Mysore State, with an outlay of about Rs. 145 crores.

(b) Does not arise in view of reply to clause (a).

THE BOMBAY TENANCY (SUSPENSION OF PROVISIONS AND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider (Contd.)

*Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA (Chikodi).—
Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of my speech yesterday, I tried to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble House the principles on which the Congress Party has been working in regard to land reforms. I pointed out, Sir, the policy that has been enunciated from time to time and even in the last election manifesto has been that the land must always go to the tillers and that tillers should be the owners. The question was and is whether the Bombay Tenancy and Agriculturists Land Act as amended in the year 1956,

has carried out and has brought into effect this important principle, and it has been my view that the Bombay Act has not done it. To illustrate what I said, I can point out that the question of ceiling, which is a very important point to illustrate that principle of land to the tiller, is not brought into effect. I said Sir, that if the provisions of section 34 were read with the definition of 'personal cultivation' it would be found that it was open to a landholder to cultivate a very large area, far larger than the so called ceiling area of 48 acres. Therefore, the Act requires overhauling in that respect.

12-30 P.M.

The question of a ceiling limit is very very important. This House will see that if there is to be an equitable distribution of lands amongst the persons who are entitled to possession and ownership of lands, then the question of ceiling is very very important. As this House knows, in the village community there are peasant proprietors, tenants, landless labourers and there are also landlords who are sometimes absentee landlords. As regards peasant proprietors who cultivate their own lands, we need not worry because it has been the policy of the Congress as also of other people in India that peasant proprietorship should be encouraged.

The second point is with respect to tenants. I need not say that the tenant class as such is a small class as compared to the entire population of the village. Most of the tenants are themselves landholders or peasant proprietors and in addition to their own land they cultivate the lands of other persons also. If this Act seeks only to protect the interests of such tenants, then I am one with the object of the Act because the interests of the tenants should be protected. But the question is as to what is to be done with respect to landless labour. As this House knows, the landless labour in villages varies from 40 to 50 per cent of the population of the village. These landless labourers work day in and day out and try to eke out a very poor living. There is no security for their